Ser. No.: 10/804,493

Reply to Feb. 7, 2008 Non-Final Office Action

<u>Remarks</u>

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-2 and 7-20 stand rejected on prior art grounds. Claim 5 and 6 stand objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this regard, claims 1, 16 and 20 have been amended to include the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 6. Hence, claims 1, 16 and 20 are now believed to be allowable. New claim 24 has also been added and incorporates the allowable subject-matter of dependent claim 6. Hence, new claim 24 is respectfully submitted to be patentable.

New independent claims 21, 22, and 23 have been added and are similar to claims 1, 16, and 20 but include the allowable subject matter of dependent claim 5. Hence, new claims 21, 22 and 23 are believed to be allowable.

In amending the present claims, Applicants do not admit that the cited references constitute prior art and Applicant reserves the right to argue that one or more of the cited references do no constitute prior art in further prosecution of the current application or a continuing application.

8

{00308138.DOC;1 }

Ser. No.: 10/804,493

Reply to Feb. 7, 2008 Non-Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims, having been given their broadest reasonable interpretation, are patentable. Based on the foregoing, Applicants believe that all of the claims in this case are now in a condition for allowance and an indication to that effect is earnestly solicited. Furthermore, if the Examiner believes that additional discussions or information might advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner should feel free to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Nenad Pejic (Reg. No. 37,415)

Calfee, Halter & Griswold, LLP

(216) 622-8835